UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,728	03/16/2004	David W. Nesbitt	06975-318002	1035

26171 7590 10/07/2004		EXAMINER
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.		MANCHO, RONNIE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3663	

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
11TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/800,728	Applicant(s) NESBITT, DAVID W.
		Examiner Ronnie Mancho	Art Unit 3663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _16 March 2004_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-36_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-36_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _3/16/04_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   This application filed under former 37 CFR 1.62 lacks the necessary reference to the

prior application. A statement reading "This is a continuation of pending application No.

10/259789, filed 9/30/2002 which claims benefit of provisional application 60/406629, filed

8/29/2002." should be entered following the title of the invention or as the first sentence of the

specification. Also, the current status of the parent nonprovisional application(s) should be

included.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   Claims 1-9, 11, 13-21, 23, 25-33, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Fugita et al (5513110).

Regarding claim 1, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose a method for determining a preferred

route using a computer-implemented routing system, the method comprising:

using a routing system to access an origin and a destination (see abstract of Fugita) in a

routing graph (hierarchy graph, figs 3) representing a network of roads including two or more

nodes (see abstract) and one or more directed links (figs. 3A, 4, 5), each directed link being

associated with a direction of travel (figs. 11 &13; col. 10, lines 11-60) along the directed link

from a starting node to an ending node (abstract; col. 6, lines 29-51) and representing a road and

each node representing an intersection that includes at least one road;

using the routing system to determine a preferred route from the origin to the destination

by using at least one directed link (abstract; col. 6, lines 29-51); and

communicating the preferred route from the routing system to a user system (last

sentence of abstract; col. 4, lines 25-31; col. 10, lines 11-28).

Regarding claim 2, Fugita et al disclose the method of claim 1 wherein determining a

preferred route from the origin to the destination by using at least one directed link comprises

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by comparing the density of

directed links in a first region of the routing graph to the density of directed links in a second

region (col. 6, lines 16-28; col. 8, lines 34-40; figs. 3) of the routing graph.

Regarding claim 3, Fugita et al disclose the method of claim 1 wherein determining a

preferred route from the origin to the destination by using at least one directed link comprises:

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by applying a factor to a

speed (col. 12, lines 10-15) associated with a particular directed link based on the density (col. 6,

lines 16-28; col. 8, lines 34-40; figs. 3) of directed links in a region of the routing graph in which

the particular directed link is located.

Regarding claim 4, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the method of claim 1 wherein

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using at least one directed link

comprises determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using directed link

information for at least one directed link.

Regarding claim 5, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the method of claim 4 wherein the directed link information includes *one or more* of a cost (col. 6, lines 1-4; col. 7, lines 41-51; col. 8, lines 16-26) associated with the directed link, whether the directed link enters a no-outlet region, whether the directed link lies within a no-outlet region, and an intersection cost for each directed link-to-link transition.

Regarding claim 6, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the method of claim 4 wherein determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using at least one directed link comprises:

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using node information for at least one node.

Regarding claim 7, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the method of claim 6 wherein the node information includes one or more directed links that link to the node, the number of driveable links that link to or from the node, and the total number of links that link to the node.

Regarding claim 8, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the preferred route is a preferred route for driving a vehicle from the origin to the destination.

Regarding claim 9, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the preferred route is a preferred route for walking from the origin to the destination.

Regarding claim 11, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the routing system and the user system use the same processor (fig. 2).

Regarding claim 13, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose a computer-readable medium or propagated signal having embodied thereon a computer program (col. 4, lines 32-45) configured

to determine a preferred route using a computer-implemented routing system, the medium or

signal comprising one or more code segments configured to:

use a routing system to access an origin and a destination (see abstract of Fugita) in a

routing graph (hierarchy graph, figs 3) representing a network of roads including two or more

nodes (see abstract) and one or more directed links (figs. 3A, 4, 5), each directed link being

associated with a direction of travel (figs. 11 &13; col. 10, lines 11-60) along the directed link

from a starting node to an ending node (abstract; col. 6, lines 29-51) and representing a road and

each node representing an intersection that includes at least one road;

use the routing system to determine a preferred route from the origin to the destination by

using at least one directed link (abstract; col. 6, lines 29-51); and

communicate the preferred route from the routing system to a user system (last sentence

of abstract; col. 4, lines 25-31; col. 10, lines 11-28).

Regarding claim 14, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the medium or signal of claim 13

wherein determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using at least one

directed link comprises:

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by comparing the density

of directed links in a first region of the routing graph to the density of directed links in a second

region (col. 6, lines 16-28; col. 8, lines 34-40; figs. 3) of the routing graph.

Regarding claim 15, Fugita et al disclose the method of claim 13 wherein determining a

preferred route from the origin to the destination by using at least one directed link comprises:

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by applying a factor to a

speed (col. 12, lines 10-15) associated with a particular directed link based on the density (col. 6,

lines 16-28; col. 8, lines 34-40; figs. 3) of directed links in a region of the routing graph in which the particular directed link is located.

Regarding claim 16, Fugita et al disclose the medium or signal of claim 13 wherein determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using at least one directed link comprises:

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using directed link information for at least one directed link.

Regarding claim 17, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the medium or signal of claim 16 wherein the directed link information includes *one or more* of a cost (col. 6, lines 1-4; col. 7, lines 41-51; col. 8, lines 16-26) associated with the directed link, whether the directed link enters a no-outlet region, whether the directed link lies within a no-outlet region, and an intersection cost for each directed link-to-link transition.

Regarding claim 18, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the medium or signal of claim 16 wherein determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using at least one directed link comprises:

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using node information for at least one node.

Regarding claim 19, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the medium or signal of claim 18 wherein the node information includes one or more directed links that link to the node, the number of driveable links that link to or from the node, and the total number of links that link to the node.

Regarding claim 20, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the medium or signal of claim 13 wherein the preferred route is a preferred route for driving a vehicle from the origin to the destination.

Regarding claim 21, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the medium or signal of claim 13 wherein the preferred route is a preferred route for walking from the origin to the destination.

Regarding claim 23, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose medium or signal of claim 13 wherein the routing system and the user system use the same processor (fig. 2).

Regarding claim 25, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose a system for determining a preferred route using a computer-implemented routing system, the system configured to:

access an origin and a destination (see abstract of Fugita) in a routing graph (hierarchy graph, figs 3) representing a network of roads including two or more nodes (see abstract) and one or more directed links (figs. 3A, 4, 5), at least one directed link being associated with a direction of travel (figs. 11 &13; col. 10, lines 11-60) along the directed link from a starting node to an ending node (abstract; col. 6, lines 29-51) and representing a road and each node representing an intersection that includes at least one road;

determine a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using at least one directed link (abstract; col. 6, lines 29-51); and

communicate the preferred route from the routing system to a user system (last sentence of abstract; col. 4, lines 25-31; col. 10, lines 11-28).

Regarding claim 26, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the system of claim 25 wherein determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using at least one directed link comprises:

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by comparing the density

of directed links in a first region of the routing graph to the density of directed links in a second

region (col. 6, lines 16-28; col. 8, lines 34-40; figs. 3) of the routing graph.

Regarding claim 27, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the system of claim 25 wherein

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using at least one directed link

comprises:

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by applying a factor to a

speed (col. 12, lines 10-15) associated with a particular directed link based on the density (col. 6,

lines 16-28; col. 8, lines 34-40; figs. 3) of directed links in a region of the routing graph in which

the particular directed link is located.

Regarding claim 28, Fugita et al disclose the system of claim 25 wherein determining a

preferred route from the origin to the destination by using at least one directed link comprises:

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using directed link

information for at least one directed link.

Regarding claim 29, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the system of claim 28 wherein the

directed link information includes *one or more* of a cost (col. 6, lines 1-4; col. 7, lines 41-51; col.

8, lines 16-26) associated with the directed link, whether the directed link enters a no-outlet

region, whether the directed link lies within a no-outlet region, and an intersection cost for each

directed link-to-link transition.

Regarding claim 30, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the system of claim 28 wherein

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using at least one directed link

comprises:

determining a preferred route from the origin to the destination by using node

information for at least one node.

Regarding claim 31, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the system of claim 30 wherein the

node information includes *one or more* directed links that link to the node, the number of

driveable links that link to or from the node, and the total number of links that link to the node.

Regarding claim 32, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the system of claim 25 wherein the

preferred route is a preferred route for driving a vehicle from the origin to the destination.

Regarding claim 33, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the system of claim 25 wherein the

preferred route is a preferred route for walking from the origin to the destination.

Regarding claim 35, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the system of claim 25 wherein the

routing system and the user system use the same processor (fig. 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 10, 12, 22, 24, 34, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Fugita et al in view of Ohmura et al (2002/0077745).

Regarding claim 10, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the method of claim 1, but did not

mention an Internet. However, in the advent of the proliferation of the Internet, Ohmura et al

(section 006) teaches of a method for determining a preferred route using a computer

implemented routing system wherein the routing system comprises:

a routing system provided through an Internet service provider (fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of navigation at

the time the invention was made to modify the Fugita et al device for the purpose of taking

advantage of the Internet wherein map data stored in a vehicles hard drive or DVD_ROM is

updated using the Internet.

Regarding claim 12, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the method of claim 1, but did not

mention an Internet. However, in the advent of the proliferation of the Internet, Ohmura et al

(section 006) teaches of a method for determining a preferred route using a computer

implemented routing system, wherein communicating the preferred route to a user comprises

communicating the preferred route over a connection that is established using the Internet (fig.

1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of navigation at

the time the invention was made to modify the Fugita et al device for the purpose of taking

advantage of the Internet wherein map data stored in a vehicles hard drive or DVD_ROM is

updated using the Internet.

Regarding claim 22, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the medium or signal of claim 13, but

did not mention an Internet. However, in the advent of the proliferation of the Internet, Ohmura

et al (section 006) teaches of a medium or signal for determining a preferred route using a

computer implemented routing system wherein the routing system comprises:

a routing system provided through an Internet service provider (fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of navigation at the time the invention was made to modify the Fugita et al device for the purpose of taking advantage of the Internet wherein map data stored in a vehicles hard drive or DVD_ROM is updated using the Internet.

Regarding claim 24, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the medium or signal of claim 13, but did not mention an Internet. However, in the advent of the proliferation of the Internet, Ohmura et al (section 006) teaches of a medium or signal for determining a preferred route using a computer implemented routing system, wherein communicating the preferred route to a user comprises communicating the preferred route over a connection that is established using the Internet (fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of navigation at the time the invention was made to modify the Fugita et al device for the purpose of taking advantage of the Internet wherein map data stored in a vehicles hard drive or DVD_ROM is updated using the Internet.

Regarding claim 34, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the system of claim 25, but did not mention an Internet. However, in the advent of the proliferation of the Internet, Ohmura et al (section 006) teaches of a medium or signal for determining a preferred route using a computer implemented routing system wherein the routing system comprises:

a routing system provided through an Internet service provider (fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of navigation at the time the invention was made to modify the Fugita et al device for the purpose of taking

advantage of the Internet wherein map data stored in a vehicles hard drive or DVD_ROM is updated using the Internet.

Regarding claim 36, Fugita et al (figs. 1-7) disclose the system of claim 25, but did not mention an Internet. However, in the advent of the proliferation of the Internet, Ohmura et al (section 006) teaches of a medium or signal for determining a preferred route using a computer implemented routing system, wherein communicating the preferred route to a user comprises communicating the preferred route over a connection that is established using the Internet (fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of navigation at the time the invention was made to modify the Fugita et al device for the purpose of taking advantage of the Internet wherein map data stored in a vehicles hard drive or DVD_ROM is updated using the Internet.

Communication

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronnie Mancho whose telephone number is 703-305-6318. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs: 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Black can be reached on 703-305-8233. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

                                                        Ronnie   Mancho
                                                        Examiner
                                                        Art Unit 3663

9/30/04

GARY CHIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER